

Jurisdictional Concerns

The City of Richmond has jurisdiction over activities within its boundaries. SLC should revise the discussion in the plans and policies and in the permitting section to reflect the potential that local entitlements (i.e. encroachment permits, design review, and/or use permits) may be required for a portion of the proposed project. The City of Richmond may be a “responsible agency” under CEQA for that purpose. The conclusion regarding policy conflict level of impact should be revised upon further analysis of jurisdictional issues.

39-2

The applicant is required to submit a “Stormwater Control Plan” to the City of Richmond at the time of application, pursuant to the San Francisco RWQCB’s C-3 regulations. This should be noted in the EIR. The applicant should also amend its NPDES permit covering refinery operations with the Regional Board to include the Marine Terminal.

Cumulative Approach

The City views Chevron’s operations as “interconnected” and “interdependent”. For example, the marine terminal is dependent upon pipeline and storage as well as refinery operations. Consequently, these impacts should be reviewed from the standpoint of cumulative impacts, to include the totality of Chevron terminal and refinery operations and properties. This should include, for example, tank farm storage issues, operations at the site of the Chevron Richmond Quarry, refinery throughput and capacity relationships to the Marine Terminal, and overall product transportation and shipping.

39-3

The City is currently reviewing the “Chevron Hydrogen Renewal Project,” for which a Master EIR is being prepared. Although, cumulative impacts are to be addressed in that EIR, timing would require the aforementioned cumulative issues to be addressed in the Marine Terminal EIR. The Marine Terminal EIR would also need to analyze the environmental implications of the proposed Chevron Renewal Project on the Marine Terminal project.

Alternatives Analysis

The concept of a consolidated terminal was discussed, however this alternative and potential to reduce water quality impacts, was only summarily addressed. This alternative needs to be more thoroughly addressed, in addition to other terminal siting alternatives (i.e. terminal collocation).

39-4

The “Full Throughput Pipeline Alternative” was similarly prematurely dismissed as infeasible. The DEIR was overly speculative in assuming that “permitting” would preclude this alternative. We concur that the “Full Throughput via Pipeline” is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. However, the DEIR analysis does not support the conclusion that the Consolidated Terminal Alternative would have greater impacts than the proposed project.